

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Nakane (US 6,240,534).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 1-7 are amended to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-8 are presently pending for consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by Nakane (US 6,240,534). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims for at least the following reasons.

With respect to independent claim 1, as currently amended, Applicants respectfully assert that Nakane fails to teach or suggest a combination of features including at least “a logic circuit to which the first reset signal and the second reset signal are inputted and controls the charging circuit and the discharging circuit.”

In contrast to the Applicants’ claimed invention, Nakane is silent with regard to the features recited in the newly amended independent claim 1. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Thus, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert

that the rejections of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because Nakane fails to disclose each and every feature recited in newly-amended independent claim 1.

Thus, in light of the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submits that dependent claims 2-8 are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above with regard to amended independent claim 1, upon which they respectively depend, as well as the individual features of dependent claims 2-8 recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

Sumiyo Onda
Reg. 62,166

Dated: January 12, 2009

Customer No. 09629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 739-3000

Facsimile: (202) 739-3001